

NEW PATENTS SEALED IN ENGLAND.

SIX MONTHS FOR ENROLMENT.

John Heathcote and Ambrose Brewin, of Tiverton, lace manufacturers, for certain improvements in the manufacture of ornamented net or lace.—Sealed February 28.

Gottlieb Bockius, of the New-road, Shepherd's Bush, Gent., for certain improved arrangements and apparatus for the production and distribution of light.—Sealed February 28.

George Bell, of Dublin, merchant, for certain improvements in machines for drying wheat, malt, corn, and seeds; and for bolting, dressing, and separating flour, meal, and other like substances.—Sealed March 1.

John Freeman, of Birmingham, machinist, for improvements in fastenings for wearing apparel.—Sealed March 2.

Thomas Simpson, of Birmingham, for a certain improvement in buckles.—Sealed March 3.

Masta Jocelin Cooke, of Gray's-Inn-square, solicitor, for certain improvements in the manufacture of artificial fuel.—Sealed March 2.

John Keely, the younger, of Nottingham, dyer, and Alexander Allott, of Lenton, bleacher, for certain improvements in machinery or apparatus for drying or freeing from liquid or moisture, woolen, cotton, silk, and different fibrous materials, and other substances; and also for stretching certain fibrous materials: being a communication.—Sealed March 2.

William Walker, of George-yard, Crown-street, Soho, coachsmith, for certain improvements in the manufacture of springs and axles for carriages.—Sealed March 2.

Charles White, of Noel-street, Islington, engineer, for certain improvements in machinery for raising and forcing fluids.—Sealed March 2.

Robert Stirling Newall, of Gateshead, Durham, wire rope manufacturer, for improvements in the manufacture of wire ropes, and in the apparatus and arrangements for the manufacture of the same.—Sealed March 6.

William Newton, of the Office for Patents, 66, Chancery-lane, civil engineer, for certain improvements in machinery or apparatus for making pins: being a communication.—Sealed March 7.

James Pilbrow, of Tottenham, engineer, for certain improvements in the application of steam, air, and other vapours, and gaseous agents, to the production of motive power, and in the machinery and apparatus by which the same are effected.—Sealed March 7.

William Bejts, of Ashford, in the county of Kent, railway contractor, and William Taylor, of the same place, plumber, for improvements in the manufacture of bricks and tiles.—Sealed March 8.

William Kenworthy, of Blackburn, in the county of Lancaster, cotton-spinner, for certain improvements in machinery or apparatus called "beaming or warping machines."—Sealed March 11.

Charles Chilton, of Gloucester-street, Curtain-road, and Frederick Braithwaite, of the New-road, engineer, for improvements in machinery for cutting or splitting wood for fuel or other purposes.—Sealed March 12.

Arthur Chilver Tupper, of New Burlington-street, Middlesex, for improvements in the means of applying, carpets and other coverings to stairs and steps, and in the construction of stairs and steps.—Sealed March 16.

Alexander Angus Croll, superintendent of the gas-works, Brick-lane, and William Richards, of the same works, mechanical inspector, for improvements in the manufacture of gas, for the purposes of illumination, and in apparatus used when transmitting and measuring gas or other fluids.—Sealed March 16.

Angier March Perkins, of Great Cornam-street, engineer, for improvements in the manufacture and melting of iron, which improvements are applicable for evaporating fluids and disinfecting oils.—Sealed March 16.

John Thomas Betts, of Smithfield-bars, Gent., for improvements in the manufacture of metal covers for bottles and certain other vessels, and in the manufacture of sheet metal for such purposes: being a communication.—Sealed March 16.

Frederick Cook Matchett, of Birmingham, manufacturer, for certain improvements in the manufacture of hinges.—Sealed March 16.

Martyn John Roberts, of Bryncaetan, Carmarthenshire, Gent., for improvements in the composition of ink, blacking, and black paint.—Sealed March 16.

James Melan, of Huntingdon, gas engineer, for improvements in the manufacture of gas retorts, and in the modes of setting gas retorts.—Sealed March 16.

William Laycock, of Liverpool, merchant, for improvements in constructing houses and such like buildings.—Sealed March 16.

Wakefield Pim, of the borough of Kingston-upon-Hull, engineer, for certain improvements in the construction and formation of buoys and other water-marks.—Sealed March 18.

Alexander Simon Wolcott, of City-terrace, City-road, machinist, and John Johnson, of Manchester, machinist, for improvements in photography, and in the application of the same to the arts.—Sealed March 18.

William Barker, of Manchester, millwright, for certain improvements in metallic pistons.—Sealed March 20.

Solomon Robinson, of Dudley, Worcestershire, roll turner, for certain improvements in the manufacture of shot.—Sealed March 20.

Joseph Needham Taylor, of Chelsea, captain in her Majesty's Navy, and William Henry Smith, of Fitzroy-square, civil engineer, for certain improvements in breakwaters, beacons, and sound alarms; also in landing or transmitting persons and goods over or through strata or obstructions of any nature, all of which may be used either separately or in combination.—Sealed March 21.

Andrew Barclay, of Kilmarnock, Scotland, brass founder, for certain improvements in lustres, chandeliers, and apparatus connected therewith, to be used with gas, oil, and other substances; which invention is also applicable to other purposes.—Sealed March 24.

Gregory Seale Walters, of Coleman-street, merchant, for improvements in the manufacture of chlorine and chlorides, and in obtaining the oxides and peroxides of Manganese, in the residuary liquids of such manufacture: being a communication.—Sealed March 24.

Alfred Hooper Nevill, of Chichester-place, Gray's-Inn-road, corn dealer, for improvements in preparing lentils and other matters for food.—Sealed March 24.

Nicolas Henri Jean Francois Comte De Crouy, of the Edgware-road, for certain improvements in rotary pumps and rotary engines.—Sealed March 25.

Robert Faraday, of Wardour-street, Soho, Gas fitter, for improvements in ventilating gas burners, and burners for consuming oil, tallow, or other matters: being a communication.—Sealed March 25.

Sir Samuel Brown, Knt., commander in her Majesty's Royal Navy, of Blackheath, for improvements in the construction of breakwaters, and in constructing and erecting lighthouses and beacons, fixed and floating, and in apparatus connected therewith; and also in anchors for mooring the same, which are applicable to ships or vessels.—Sealed March 27.

John Sylvester, of Great Russell-street, Middlesex, engineer, for certain improvements in producing ornamental surfaces, on or with iron, applicable in the manufacture of stoves and other uses; and for improvements in modifying the transmission of heat.—Sealed March 28.

Arthur Dunn, of Rotherhithe, soap-boiler, for improvements in treating, purifying, and bleaching fatty matters.—Sealed March 28.

EAST COWES PARK.

THE following case, which was tried in the Vice-Chancellor's Court on Thursday last, involving the right of certain individuals to make bricks in such situations where the nuisance (if any) could only prove of a temporary nature, will doubtless possess much interest for many of our readers:—

BANWELL v. BROOKS.—The Solicitor-General (with Mr. Stuart and Mr. Shebbear) moved, on behalf of the defendant, Mr. George Eyre Brooks, formerly an auctioneer in London, to dissolve an injunction granted *ex parte* on the 7th inst. whereby he was restrained from burning any bricks on a piece of land called Shambliss Farm, which was within the space of 1,500 feet from any part of the boundary hedge separating it from the lawn of East Cowes Castle. The injunction was asked to be dissolved on the ground of misrepresentation and concealment of the real facts of the case when the application was made to the court *ex parte*. The affidavit of the plaintiff in support of his motion had simply stated that he was the owner of Cowes Castle, and that the defendant, who had purchased some adjoining land on a building speculation, to be called East Cowes Park, commenced burning bricks during the summer of last year on a part of the farm that was situate at the greatest distance from the Castle, and did not threaten to burn them at a nearer point than about half a mile from the Castle, but that he had then lately commenced burning his bricks within ten feet of the hedge, and not more

than 292 yards from the principal windows of the Castle, which looked towards the south, and as the lawn, which was on a gradual declivity towards the hedge, was all that intervened between the Castle and the brick kiln, there was nothing to interrupt the noxious effluvia, which found its way into the drawing-room, conservatories, and all the best portions of the building, and that the defendant had refused, upon notice, to make any statement of the nuisance. The answer of Mr. Brooks now disclosed the additional facts, that on the 27th of June, 1841, shortly after he had made the purchase, he communicated by letter to the Earl of Shannon, who was then the proprietor of East Cowes Castle, the purposes for which he had bought the estate, and his intention to burn bricks thereon. He also caused to be drawn up, printed, and circulated plans, prospectuses, and statements, showing how the estate was intended to be laid out in parks, pleasure gardens, and grounds for building purposes, and setting forth the advantages of getting bricks thereon; and in March last entered into an agreement with Messrs. Chessum, builders, of Brighton, for the purpose of digging for brick-earth for making bricks to be used in the erection of the houses to be built by them on the estate, but the purposes were merely temporary, and it was not intended the land should be used as a permanent brickfield. The defendant also stated by his answer that he frequently saw the plaintiff in London about the time of his purchase of Cowes Castle, when he showed him plans of building which were all then laid out, and told him that several houses were in the course of erection, and that he intended to let the adjoining portion of the land to a Brighton builder for the purpose of making bricks, which would be immediately made, and that the plaintiff offered no objection whatever. It was also shown that the intervening land, which was stated to be a lawn, was in fact pasture fields, and besides, to the hedge there was a cow-shed thirty feet long, rick and wood yards, and a great many lofty trees and thick plantations upon it, of which no mention had been made by the plaintiff. In addition to this concealment and misrepresentation, it was argued that it was not such a case of irreparable injury as to justify the Court interfering *ex parte*, but on the contrary, being only at most a temporary nuisance, the Court would not interfere at all. Sir C. Wetherell, Mr. Bethell, and Mr. Gifford were heard in support of the injunction, and insisted there had been no misrepresentation or suppression of any material fact on the part of the plaintiff, and that the case on which the Court had declared the plaintiff entitled to an injunction to abate a most intolerable nuisance had not been displaced by either the answer or the arguments of the defendant. The Vice-Chancellor said he should certainly dissolve the injunction. He then read those passages from the defendant's answer in which he stated that he communicated his intention to employ the land for building purposes, and to make bricks, to the Earl of Shannon, and afterwards to the plaintiff himself, and observed that not one word of this statement was to be found either in the plaintiff's bill or affidavit. It was obvious that the plaintiff must necessarily long before the filing of the bill have known what the defendant intended to do, and therefore it was utterly indefensible in him to file his bill and take no notice of these circumstances, which had then been stated to the Court, the injunction would never have been granted *ex parte*. That alone was a sufficient reason for dissolving the injunction. If, however, it could be shown that the defendant had also acted unfairly, the Court might be asked to set off one misconduct against the other. His Honour, however, so far from thinking so, proceeded to point out some other matters of misrepresentation on the side of the plaintiff, and said that all he could do with the case was to dissolve the injunction with costs. Sir C. Wetherell—I am very sorry your Honour, considering the pains you have taken, should be troubled with a second case. I hope Mr. Auldjo will proceed. The Vice-Chancellor—Oh! I am willing to hear him; but whether Mr. Auldjo may have equal pleasure in bringing the case before me, is another point!

The inhabitants of Cheltenham have hit upon an excellent plan of relieving the distress of the poor, and particularly the privations which masons, bricklayers, and labourers experience in the winter season. The money collected as a relief fund is made to contribute to the improvement of the town and the comfort of the inhabitants by being applied to the repair and completion of the foot pavements. It is a strange thing, however, that charity should be required to suggest that which we have long thought common sense would have dictated the necessity of, namely, a provision for the employment of the class of building artificers mentioned above, in sheds and workshops during winter and bad weather. There is a great deal of work done out of doors, and in the fine season, that might well be postponed or prepared as we have suggested.